423 The lack of formal title to their land under the Venezuelan legal system
648 presents, for the moment, no special problem as regards land used for dwelling, farming, hunting, and fishing. There is no pressure on such land and at present no tendency by non-Kamarakotos to compete for it, although a colonization scheme such as has been suggested might suddenly present the Indians with a
316 very serious and perhaps, for them, insoluble problem. They are, however,
423 already aware of possible difficulty as regards title to the gold deposits in their
643 territory, even though the gold so far discovered has not been sufficient to
[648] cause a serious invasion of their remote region. Their reasoned attitude regarding this is to establish title to the gold deposits for the cacique. In their consideration he is not, however, a personal owner but only a custodian on behalf of the whole group, just as household property can be considered as belonging, in a rather vague but real sense, to the head of the household but is freely used by all its members. There is a rather close analogy to the crown lands of a constitutional monarchy, where title is said to belong to the king but he is in fact an owner only as he represents the state as a whole and the property is actually communal.

This communal nature of the mines that "belong" to the cacique is shown in practice by the fact that any adult male member of the tribe has the right of working the mines and that the gold found by any man becomes his personal property without any deduction of royalty, rental, or tribute. Even further than this, if a particularly rich pocket is discovered it is customary to notify the other members of the tribe so that anyone who wishes to can share in it.

422 Movable possessions are more rigidly owned than is land and in this case
425 the ownership is usually to be considered as purely personal and not as communal even in the sense that household lands belong to the family group rather than specifically to the to?-esa? as an individual. Here the principles of ownership arising from manufacture, as between different households, and from use,
[437] as within a household, are dominant. Thus a new hammock made by a woman of a given household is the property of that household and its barter to another group may be by the maker or by the to?-esa? as representing the household, but if it is assigned to and used by a particular member of the household, it is
[437] his, or her, personal property. So, too, in barter or purchase of goods from
[439] other tribes or from Venezuelans, this may be done on a purely personal basis or by the to?-esa? for his household and subsequent personal ownership is established by the individual who uses the object or material in question.

[126] In our trading with the Indians, it was noteworthy, for instance, that a basket made, of course, by a man but already in use by a woman, was not sold except with the woman's consent and that the price was generally payable to her or for her benefit. On the other hand, a new basket was sold by and for the
461 maker. In paying for labor, the women gene[illegible]ly spent the sums due them on
465 themselves and on the young children, not [illegible] their husbands. Commonly a man
[593] would trade his labor for goods for his family rather than for himself.